

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14-18, 20-23, and 25 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 14, 20, and 25 are independent. In the Office Action dated August 18, 2010, Claims 1-6, 9-12, and 25 were allowed; Claims 14-18 and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; and Claims 14-18 and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. **Rejection of Claims 14-18 and 20-23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 14-18 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as not containing statutory subject matter. Claims 14 and 20 have been amended and Applicants respectfully suggest that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

II. **Rejection of Claims 14-18 and 20-23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 14-18 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0196094 ("Hillis"). Claims 14 and 20 have been amended to include subject matter which has been indicated as allowable subject matter over the prior art. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 14 and 20.

Dependent Claims 15-18 and 21-23 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 14 and 20 and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 14 and 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 15-18 and 21-23.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

Date: September 28, 2010

/Christopher J. Leonard/  
Christopher J. Leonard  
Reg. No. 41,940

MIK/sem